DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 882 PS 011 679

AUTHOR Floody, Dale R.
TITLE An Early Childhood Educator's Guide to Prosocial Development.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Standards; *Classroom Techniques; Cooperation; Discipline; Early Childhood Education; Group Activities; *Modeling (Psychology); *Peer Teaching; *Positive Reinforcement; *Prosocial Behavior; Research; *Role Playing; Young Children

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews research findings that are related to fostering prosocial behavior in the early childhood and elementary classroom. A collection of "experimental best bets" for increasing prosocial behavior in young children is outlined. This collection covers the role of reinforcement and modeling or imitation, the importance of group norms, use of role playing experiences, peer teaching, cooperative group activities, and the influence of child-rearing and discipline techniques. In addition, a short review of the history of research on prosocial behavior is given. Research has demonstrated that the frequency of prosocial behavior is situationally determined and is not a consistent trait of individuals. Also, prosocial behavior is only moderately related to moral behavior, empathy and cooperation. However, the child who is frequently prosocial is seldom likely to be aggressive. The relations between prosocial behavior and sex differences, age differences, birth order and family size are also mentioned. Factors which have been found to increase the incidence of prosocial behavior in children are positive reinforcement, nurturant models, moralizing or preaching by powerful figures, role-playing experience, assignment of responsibility for the welfare of others, cooperative group activities, and use of induction disciplinary techniques. (Author/SS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED192882

PS011679

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

An Early Childhood Educator's Guide to Prosocial Development

Dale R. Floody, Ph.D.

University of Wisconsin Center-Barron County

August, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dale R. Floody

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

What is prosocial behavior? In general, a prosocial act benefits another, as opposed to other (possibly antisocial) methods of interacting. Each of the following adjectives (and others like them) have been used as examples of prosocial behavior:

Aiding, Altruistic, Benevolent, Charitable, Comforting, Concerned, Considerate, Cooperative, Defending, Donating, Empathic, Friendly, Generous, Giving, Helping, Nurturant, Other-directed, Protective, Rescuing, Sensitive, Sharing, Supportive, Sympathetic, Unselfish, Volunteering.

Between 1965 and 1980, psychologists have completed literally hundreds of studies related to the development of prosocial behaviors in children. They have examined characteristics of prosocial children, as well as of their parents and teachers. Further they have studied a variety of techniques that might conceivably increase prosocial behaviors. For the reader who may be interested in examining several of these studies, a representative sample may be found in the Bibliography.

Unfortunately, the majority of these articles might not appear particularly relevant to early childhood educators. Most involve short-term studies done by psychologists in laboratory settings (as opposed to early childhood centers); the results of the studies are primarily published in psychological journals. Very little effort has been made toward making this information available to early childhood educators, for possible use in their day-to-day interactions with children.

As a result, the author began in 1975 to collect all the available experimental evidence related to prosocial development, and to consolidate this evidence into a seminar for early childhood educators. In a sense, the seminar involved a collection of "experimental best bets" for increasing prosocial behaviors in children. During the past five years, it has been both rewarding and enjoyable to share this seminar with quite a variety of nursery school, day care, elementary and special education teachers. Further, in one early childhood education center a number of preschool children were evaluated both before and after their teachers participated in the seminar. Activities of the teachers following the seminar did in fact significantly increase prosocial behaviors in the children.

The following paper represents another version of that seminar. It has been continuously revised as new experimental evidence becomes available (there are probably as many theories about prosocial development as there are psychologists). Further, the seminar has been continuously revised because of my interactions with early childhood educators. I am particularly indebted to those educators---many of their thoughts, reactions, feelings and ideas are incorporated throughout the following guide.

A Brief History of the Study of Prosocial Behavior in Children

Several thousand years ago (as far back as Plato, Socrates and Aristotle), philosophers began debating whether children are "inherently good" or "inherently evil". On the one hand, it was argued that children are born kind, innocent and gentle; child-rearing should involve providing a safe, secure and supportive environment ("fertile ground so that the flower may grow and bloom naturally"). On the other hand, others argued that children are born evil and wicked; child-rearing should then involve controlling children and/or punishing undesirable behaviors ("spare the rod and spoil the child").

Variations of this age-old argument have persisted throughout the centuries, and are still with us today (are children naturally prosocial, but learn to be antisocial as they grow older, or is it the other way around?). Today, however, most psychologists seem to agree that behaviors are the result of both inborn (inherent) tendencies and learning experiences that the child has had. Further, inborn tendencies and learning experiences interact in complicated ways. As there is relatively little the early childhood educator can do about inborn tendencies, that educator must focus on the child's learning experiences if one wishes to increase the probability of prosocial behavior.

Promoting positive and prosocial behavior has for many years received considerable emphasis in day care and early education in the United States. Further, it is widely accepted that such behavior is best learned in the free play environment. Children learn positive attitudes through freely interacting with other children. The teacher's role is primarily that of supportive observer (unless, of course, Johnny starts breaking windows with his hammer).

Psychologists, on the other hand, did not become very interested in prosocial behavior until quite recently. Throughout much of history, psychological researchers appeared primarily interested in offensive or undesirable behaviors (aggression and violence, psychological abnormalities, etc.). In the mid-1960's, a young woman was brutally assailed and murdered in New York City. In spite of the fact that at least thirty-eight people heard her cries for help, no one intervened or even called the police. Two psychologists (Bibb Latané and John Darley) were especially interested in the fact that no one helped. As a result, they began a series of studies in the determinents of emergency helping. Their efforts appear to have launched a nationwide study of all forms of prosocial behavior (including that in children).

In a relatively short period of time, psychologists were investigating the effects on prosocial behavior in children of positive reinforcement, modeling, norms, role playing, assignment of responsibility for the welfare of others, cooperative endeavors, disciplinary techniques, etc. (each of these will be discussed in greater detail later in this paper).

In attempting to determine which children were more prosocial, psychologists used a wide variety of measures, including the following:

1) Donating candy or other valued items (either to friends, to other children, or to "the poor").
2) Sharing toys with friends and/or strangers.
3) Cooperation games, in which children can win prizes only if they cooperate (competition leads to everyone's losing).
4) Naturalistic observations (for example, how many times does the child help another child in a one-hour period?).

5) Teacher and/or peer ratings (for example, "Which child in your class is the kindest? The second kindest?").
6) Amount of work the child is willing to volunteer to help another child.
7) Rescue behavior (for example, is the child willing to go into the next room to help a child who appears to be crying?).
8) Helping an adult pick up items that he or she has dropped (for example, a box of paper clips).

Several general statements about the research may be appropriate at this point. First, does prosocial behavior appear to be stable or consistent? For example, if Sally donates most of her candy to the poor, is it a good bet that she'll also share toys with her friends, be rated as prosocial by her teacher, help adults, and cooperate in games? Psychologists have been quite interested in these questions, because if there is such a thing as a "prosocial child", then he or she should act prosocially in a variety of situations. Frankly, research has demonstrated that children are not as consistent as we might expect or hope. Relations across various situations (rescuing, helping, sharing, etc.) are at best moderate (though such relations do certainly exist). In general, some children in any given situation appear to be more likely to help than others; but whether or not they help depends on a great variety of circumstances. The techniques and methods to be discussed throughout this paper are meant to increase the likelihood of any child acting prosocially.

Prosocial behaviors have also been shown to be moderately related to moral behaviors (honesty, telling the truth, etc.), empathy (the "ability to put yourself in another's shoes"), and cooperation. Conversely, they have been shown to be negatively related to aggressive and violent behaviors. That is, the child who is frequently prosocial is likely to be seldom aggressive. As a result, the reduction of aggression is a potential bonus of increasing prosocial behaviors!

Several other general characteristics have been studied in children, including the following:

A. Age differences - A number of studies indicate that children become more prosocial as they grow older; although a few studies did not indicate such differences. In general, be aware that it may be much easier for a 5-year old to share than it is for a 3-year old.
B. Sex differences - Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, there appear to be no consistent overall differences between boys and girls in prosocial behavior. In several studies girls were more prosocial, in several others boys were, but in the majority of studies there were no differences. (It should be noted that this is certainly not the case for physical aggression. Research consistently indicates that boys are more physically aggressive than girls. However, this aggressiveness does not appear to prevent boys from also acting prosocially).
C. Birth order and family size - there is some evidence that older children in a family, and children from larger families, tend to be somewhat more prosocial. Although the evidence is certainly not overwhelming at this point, you may want to be at least aware of the possibility of such differences.

Reinforcement for Prosocial Behavior

Which of the following is easier to notice in a room filled with active preschoolers?

a) Several 3-year olds are quietly(?) playing in the block area. Two of them decide that a particular curved block is especially well suited for their own individual block structure. As they both reach for the block at the same time, a struggle is likely to develop. One hits the other, who retaliates by tossing a block, which leads to pandemonium (complete with tears, threats, shouts and recriminations).

b) The same 3-year olds are quietly playing in the block area. Another child, who happens to be passing by, notices that one of the children is having problems balancing part of a block structure. Quietly, he stops and points out a structural problem, helps the child to correct it, and then goes on about his business.

Obviously, it's much easier to notice the first incident. Further, it's much more likely that adults will get involved, and that reinforcements will be forthcoming. In this case, the reinforcements may well be negative, involving things like:

a) telling the children they're "naughty", and shouldn't fight.
b) making the children sit quietly in a corner.
c) informing the children that they won't be getting a cookie after lunch.
d) threatening to tell the children's parents (or actually telling them).

It has been repeatedly demonstrated that frequent use of negative reinforcement (or "punishment") can actually increase aggressive behaviors in children (rather than reduce them). Further, and more important to the present dicussion, frequent use of punishment can reduce prosocial behaviors. This is not to say that negative reinforcement should never be used in the early childhood setting. However, it should be used sparingly, immediately after the misdeed, in an overall context of warmth and acceptance; the child should know exactly why the negative reinforcement occurred, and he should be given the opportunity to "make up for" his or her misdeed.

It is especially important that adults notice the second incident above, and administer appropriate positive reinforcements. If we wish to increase prosocial behaviors, we must positively reinforce them (whether through acknowledging and expressing joy for what the child has done, praising him, granting him special status, or whatever). All too often, it is easier to give negative rather than positive reinforcement.

Positive reinforcement appears to increase the likelihood of prosocial behavior in two important ways. First, it tends to pair a positive feeling (following expressions of joy, support, etc. from others) with the prosocial act. Later, the act itself can bring back the positive feeling (those of you who are familiar with psychological jargon may have noticed the concept of "classical conditioning"). Second, but certainly no less important, children spend a considerable amount of time learning the consequences of their acts in certain situations. Clearly, if they learn that prosocial acts lead to positive consequences, they are more likely to act prosocially in the future.

An interesting thing can happen when children begin to act more prosocially because of positive reinforcement from adults. Charlesworth & Hartup (1967) observed the following types of reinforcements among children in preschool classes:

a) Giving positive attention and approval (attending, offering praise and approval, smiling and laughing, verbal help, etc.).
b) Giving affection and personal acceptance (both physical and verbal).
c) Submission (imitation, sharing, accepting another's idea, allowing another child to play, etc.).
d) Token giving (giving physical objects, such as food or toys, without being asked).

Perhaps not too surprisingly, they found that prosocial children are much more likely to receive the above positive reinforcements from other preschool children. In other words, being prosocial will also lead to positive reinforcement from other children.

Modeling

The concept of "modeling" (or "imitation") has stimulated considerable research in the area of prosocial development. In its simplest form, if children observe someone acting prosocially, they are more likely to act prosocially themselves.

A study in this area by Yarrow, Scott & Waxler (1973) is perhaps the most impressive and relevant. Over a 6-week period, teachers acted as models of prosocial behavior with the following methods:

A. Pictured distresses (children were shown a number of pictures depicting events like the following; an adult stated ways that she would help if she were there when such events happened).
   1. Child climbing tree, caught by clothes
   2. Child hit on head by swing
   3. Dog's chain wound around tree
   4. Man trips on rock, glasses fall

B. Dioramas (miniature models found themselves in a number of situations like the following; an adult modeled various helping acts using the models).
   1. Baby bird fallen from nest
   2. Baby reaching for ball outside playpen
   3. Child struggling to pull cart up steps
   4. Mother trips, dropping dishes

C. Behavioral incidents (a number of actual events like the following were staged in the preschool setting; again, an adult acted as a model of prosocial behavior).
   1. Mouse in cage, unable to reach food
   2. Child heard crying in next room
   3. Adult hits thumb while hanging picture
   4. One child at party without cake

According to Yarrow, Scott & Waxler, modeling always consisted of:

a) the adult's verbalized awareness of the distress.
b) her sympathy and help for the victim.
c) her pleasure or relief at the comfort or well-being that resulted.
d) her use of the word "help" to summarize what had been done.

The children were tested two weeks later, and demonstrated that the variety of modeling experiences did substantially increase prosocial behaviors. The increase was particularly evident when the model had been consistently nurturant throughout the training session. Nurturance involved being friendly, supportive, sympathetic, protective, giving frequent praise, and responding to bids for attention. (Note: nurturance was not indiscriminate--limits were set when deemed appropriate.)

In short, nurturant models increased prosocial behavior. Quite a number of other studies have indicated the importance of the following considerations about models:

A. A model who is well-liked, respected and "powerful" (that is, has some control over the child's life) is much more influential. Obviously, teachers of young children can easily fit into this category.

B. A model is not very effective if hypocritical (that is, tells children that they should be prosocial, but is not prosocial herself--does not "practice what she preaches". In fact, not only are such models not often imitated, but they also tend to be devalued or "looked down upon" by the children. Further, their approval is considered to be aversive.

C. It is very important that the model talks about what he or she is doing, and appears to like or enjoy doing it. Similarly, the model's effectiveness is increased if he or she is in some way reinforced or rewarded by others for the prosocial act.

D. Models who are similar to the children should also be considered. Specifically, they will pay attention to and tend to imitate actions of other children in the center.

E. The modeling lesson appears better learned if the children can or must participate in the prosocial act. For example, if children observe a model donating to charity, and then are given the opportunity of donating also, or are told that they "must also want to donate"--the children are much more likely to donate to charity in the future.

On a more general and theoretical level, there are several reasons why models are so influential. First, they increase the child's awareness of the many different ways that one can respond to certain situations. Second, they supply information as to what appropriate behaviors might be in those situations. Finally, they help to supply information about the consequences and/or rewardingness of those behaviors.

Models can also have negative effects. For example, if children frequently observe others who do not act prosocially ("models of inaction"), they will tend not to also. Perhaps more importantly, it is well established that children learn aggressive behaviors through observing aggressive models.

Aggressive modeling is perhaps most evident in television programing. Violence is often depicted as enjoyable, rewarding and adventurous. There is considerable disagreement among the experts as to the effect of such aggressive programing. Some argue that watching aggressive programs leads to less aggression in children by "draining off" aggressive impulses (the "catharsis theorists"). Others argue that children model themselves after the aggressive T.V. characters (the "modeling theorists"). Others argue that watching violent programs may, in fact, have little or no effect on later aggression in children. Frankly, the area is very difficult to do research in, and the evidence at this point is by no means conclusive.

There is a possibility, however, that appropriate television programing can serve to increase prosocial behavior in children. The two most frequently mentioned programs in this respect are Mr. Rogers and Sesame Street. In general, research indicates that both programs (particularly Mr. Rogers) have the capability of increasing prosocial behaviors in children. The increase appears especially marked if the program is discussed and emphasized in the preschool setting after it's over.

Although children occasionally see models of prosocial behavior, it may help to stage incidents from time to time to insure that they see more. For example, teachers who have participated in past seminars have been known to drop pencils, paper clips, purses, etc. at a surprising rate. In every instance, a model of helping behavior (familiar with many of the issues previously discussed) was ready and willing to help. The teachers report that the exercise proved quite useful. Further, whenever someone is naturally prosocial, they are quite willing to point it out to the children--so that the individual may serve as an obvious prosocial model.

Norms

"It's good to help someone in distress." "It's right to give to charity." "You should share." "It's not right to be selfish." "You shouldn't steal." "It's not good to fight." The preceding statements are examples of "norms"--frequently repeated cultural statements about what one should or shouldn't do.

As has been noted by several investigators, we probably all too often emphasize the "shall nots" rather than the "shalls". "You shouldn't fight" rather than "You should play together cooperatively". All the same, the idea of "prosocial norms" has generated a certain amount of research. In general, researchers have examined several such norms: the norm of "giving" ("you should give"); the norm of "social responsibility" ("you should take care of others"); the norm of "reciprocity" ("if someone helps you, you should help back"); and the norm of "distributive justice" ("if someone is cheated or left out, you should help him; but if someone cheats or has more than others, you need not help him").

Unfortunately, there was a period of time when norms developed a rather bad reputation in psychological research. First of all, norms are quite often vague

and even contradictory. "It's good to help when someone else is distressed", but "It's not good to stick your nose into someone else's business." "Turn the other cheek", but "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth".

Second, and perhaps more important, there were serious questions as to whether norms really influence children's behavior at all. Countless investigators encouraged children to help, to donate, or to share. And the investigators repeatedly found later the same day that their encouragement had little or no effect. A number of other variables (especially modeling) were shown to be much more likely to effect children's prosocial behavior. In fact, many concluded that behavior which is highly valued culturally is all too easily influenced or altered by the immediate situation. As a result, many concluded that norms are not influential, and that repeating them is not worth the effort.

Several more recent studies, on the other hand, support the use of norms. For example, Rushton (1975) repeatedly encouraged children to donate to charity ("We should share." "It's good to give." "It's right to share." "You should give.") Perhaps not surprisingly, the encouragement seemed not to affect the children later that same day (that is, they were no more likely to share). However, Rushton took the unique step of returning two months later, and found that the same children were then much more willing to give. The apparent existence of such a "sleeper effect" may indicate that it takes some time for the message to "sink in".

In a second study, Waxler, Yarrow & King (1979) found that frequent maternal "moralizing" ("It's not nice to bite other children", etc.) led to increased likelihood of prosocial behavior (in this case, helping a distressed child in the next room). The same year, Eisenberg-Berg & Geisheker (1979) found evidence that preaching ("You should share"; "It's the right thing to do") effectively increased prosocial behavior if the preacher is "powerful" (that is, an important figure in the child's life, such as a teacher or principal). It is perhaps important that, in previous studies of norms, the "preacher" was usually an experimenter that the children were not familiar with (and, as a result, he or she was perhaps not especially powerful in the children's opinion).

In short, recent evidence indicates that preaching and encouragement of prosocial behavior by teachers and parents ("powerful" figures) may increase the likelihood of such behaviors. However, the changes may well be maddeningly slow in coming about (but don't give up hope!).

Role Playing

Jean Piaget, the influential developmental psychologist, has repeatedly emphasized the importance to social development of children playing with other children. Most importantly, play can lead to a decline in "egocentrism" (exclusive concern with oneself) and an increase in "decentration" (ability to understand the roles and feelings of another person). Or, if you will, play can lead to an increase in "empathy" (the ability to "put yourself in another person's shoes"), and in the ability to intellectually deal with another's perspective.

The above considerations have prompted several researchers to create or encourage certain types of play that are more likely to decrease egocentrism and

increase decentration. For example, Burns & Brainerd encouraged young children to engage in more dramatic play (restaurant, grocery store, etc.) than they normally would. Subsequent testing indicated that the children were much more able to take the perspective of others.

More directly related to prosocial behavior, Staub (1971) outlined the following situations for a group of preschoolers:

1) A child is trying to carry a chair that is too heavy for him/her.
2) A child falls off of a chair, bumps his/her head, and is crying.
3) A child is distressed because his/her building blocks have been taken away by another child.
4) A child is standing in the path of an oncoming bicycle.
5) A child falls and is hurt.

The children were asked what they could do to help in the above situations, and then "role played" (acted out) the various solutions (one child played the helper, another the "helpee"). The experimenter felt free to add other solutions the children may not have thought of. The role playing experiences significantly increased helping of a distressed child in the next room for girls; and significantly increased sharing in boys (implying that the training had generalized to other situations).

In a similar study, Ianotti (1978) had children role play the following roles in a variety of situations: aggressor, victim, helper, recipient of aid, someone in need, and someone sharing. Children then were asked and discussed several questions. For example, "helpers" were asked why they did what they did, how do they feel after helping, and what they plan on doing next. "Helpees" were asked how they feel after being helped, and what he or she thinks about it. Again, the role playing experiences significantly increased subsequent prosocial behaviors.

Role playing experiences appear to increase the following abilities:

1) The ability to recognize the feelings and physical or psychological needs of others.
2) The ability to label (and, as a result, think about) the feelings and physical or psychological needs of others.
3) The ability to understand the causes of feelings and physical or psychological needs of others.
4) The ability to take the overall emotional perspective of others.

Further, role playing involves (a) instructions or norms (because children and teacher are discussing what is good or right); (b) modeling (because children observe other children acting prosocially); and (c) practice (because the children themselves are actually doing it). In addition, prosocial role playing activities are relatively easy to introduce into the usual day-to-day activities or a typical early childhood program. As a result, prosocial role playing activities would appear to be prime candidates for increasing the likelihood of prosocial behaviors in preschool children.

In fact, a preschool educator of my acquaintance had children role play solutions to the following situations:

1) Child grabs toy from another child.
2) Child falls off of chair.
3) Child hits another child.
4) Child drops heavy box on foot.
5) Child has no place to sit in the reading circle.

Another preschool educator nicely introduced role playing into ongoing activities of the center related to Easter. Treats were hidden in the center, and children were told that they could each have one treat. Children were asked (a) what they would do if they found a treat but another didn't; (b) what if a child found a treat but fell down going to get it; and (c) what if a child was crying because she couldn't find a treat. Children gave their solutions to the problems, and enacted many of them.

Responsibility for Others

Cross-cultural investigations have led to some interesting comparisons between growing up in the United States and growing up in a variety of other countries. In one such comparison, research indicated that children in the U.S. could probably benefit from being more frequently assigned responsibility for the welfare of others. For example, in an extensive study of the children of six different cultures, Whiting & Whiting (1975) found that children in simpler cultures were given more responsibility for the welfare of others, and became more nurturant-responsible as a result. Similarly, Bronfenbrenner (1972) found that Soviet children, raised in a collective environment which emphasized responsibility for self and others, tended to be much more prosocial than other children.

In our individualized and "self-actualizing" world, we seldom emphasize the idea of looking out for someone else's welfare. On the other hand, telling a child that he or she is responsible for others, and giving him or her the opportunity to practice such responsibility, will surely increase the likelihood of prosocial behavior.

For example, Staub (1970) left children alone in an experimental situation with the statement "I'll leave you in charge of things, OK?" These children were later much more willing to help a distressed child in the next room. In a later study, Staub (1975) gave 5th and 6th graders the responsibility of teaching school-related skills to other children. These "mini-teachers" later acted much more prosocially in a variety of other situations. Several other studies with school-age children point to a number of advantages that follow when they are given the responsibility of teaching skills to other children (many of these studies are reviewed by Gaertner, Kohler & Reisman, 1971).

The idea of children teaching children is appropriate not only to school-age children. For example, an early childhood educator of my acquaintance taught two 4-year-old girls how to make egg carton flowers; the girls were the "teachers" for this class project. Children who learned quickly were encouraged to help the rest, to the mutual satisfaction of all (including the teachers!).

Allowing children to teach other children is but one example of assignment of responsibility for the welfare of others. Other approaches are almost limitless. For example, when crossing streets, assign responsibility for a 3-year-old's safety to a 5-year-old. Allow children to set the table before lunch. Children should clean up after themselves as much as possible after playing. If one child is feeling sad, see if another child can cheer him up.

In general, children learn to behave prosocially by acting prosocially. Further, they learn that they are expected to help others, and that it can be rewarding to do so. They learn a sense of mastery or competence in their ability to

help others. Let's allow them to do so!

Cooperation/Competition

Cooperation involves two or more people working toward a common goal. Competition, on the other hand, involves winners and losers. In his study of cooperation and competition, Madsen (1967) developed a rather unique game for children. If the children work together and cooperate, everyone comes out a winner (and receives candy bars, dimes, or whatever). If the children compete, on the other hand, everyone comes out a loser (receiving no candy bars, dimes or whatever). In short, competition is not in the best interests of the players.

In spite of this set-up, many children appear unable to control the impulse to be competitive. In fact, after quite a variety of studies, no one has been able to find a group of children more competitive (even when not in their best interests) than middle-class, white, American males, especially those from urban areas. We certainly encourage and promote competition in our culture.

At one point in the history of Psychology, it was felt that competition provided a safe outlet for aggressive impulses that build up within people. As a result, it was felt that competition would decrease aggression. The classic "Robbers Cave Experiment" (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif, 1961), in which extreme competition was encouraged in a summer camp for boys, called this theory into question. If anything, aggression was increased considerably.

Recent studies have led to similar conclusions. Participation in competitive activities increases aggressive behaviors. Perhaps more important, a growing body of research indicates that competition reduces the tendency to understand the feelings of others, and that competition reduces prosocial behavior (especially if the child loses in competition, although winning also leads to reduced prosocial behavior--see Barnett, 1975; Barnett & Bryan, 1974; Bryant, 1977).

If competition increases aggression and decreases prosocial behavior, then cooperation should have the opposite (and desirable) effect. In fact, several studies indicate that this may be the case (see Bryan, 1975; Cook & Stingle, 1974). Although the preceding does not imply that all competition should be removed from early childhood centers, it does argue in favor of more cooperative, group-reward type of activities. For example, one early childhood educator provided the children with a very large picture of zoo animals to be colored. No one child could complete it alone (at least not in a reasonable period of time), but by working cooperatively together the picture was completed to the satisfaction of all (and proudly displayed on the wall). Another early childhood educator had children work together painting a large sign to advertise their upcoming street fair. Another began actively looking for cooperative activities that naturally occurred in the center (for example, children working together on a block building), and went out of her way to loudly praise such activities.

Potential cooperative activities are almost unlimited, and they are relatively easy to introduce into the daily activities of early childhood centers. Their presence should rapidly help to increase the likelihood of prosocial behaviors.

Child-Rearing Techniques and Discipline

Although researchers have attempted to relate a variety of child-rearing or disciplinary techniques to prosocial behavior, the three disciplinary techniques described by Hoffman (1963, 1975) have probably generated the most interest. They include the following:

1) Power assertion: frequently taking advantage of the power that adults have over children. For example, depriving the child of treats or from watching television, preventing him or her from playing with favorite toys, or making him or her sit in a corner. Physical punishment (spankings, etc.) also classifies as power assertion. A variety of studies consistently indicate that frequent use of power assertion (including physical punishment) decreases the likelihood of prosocial behaviors (as well as increasing aggression).

2) Love Withdrawal: frequently informing the child that his or her actions make him or her "unlovable". For example, "I can't believe that you did that"; "I don't like you anymore"; "You are the worst child in the class"; "Get out of my sight"; etc. A variety of studies consistently indicate that frequent use of love withdrawal is unrelated to the likelihood of prosocial behavior. That is, a child frequently exposed to love withdrawal is no more but no less likely to act prosocially.

3) Induction: attempting to communicate to the child the influence that his or her actions have on other people. In other words, the use of reasoning to enhance the perception of the needs and feelings of others. Further, if the child harms another, the adult might suggest reparation and/or apology. In a sense, the emphasis centers on "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you". The approach is often referred to as "victim-centered" discipline. A variety of studies consistently indicate that frequent use of induction increases the likelihood of prosocial behaviors. As an example of the use of induction, a teacher observed a child hitting another in the face with a toy. She immediately discussed with the child how much it probably hurt; what might have happened to the child's face (a bruise, broken nose, cut lip, etc.); and how the hurt child might be made to feel better (apologize to him, etc.).

Clearly, a warm, loving and nurturant environment also contributes to the development of prosocial behavior. Staub (1975) pointed out the following advantages of nurturnace:

1) Creates a comfortable and secure environment, leading to reduced self-concern.
2) Creates a positive inclination toward other people.
3) Improved learning of social responsibility occurs within a positive, accepting and affectionate emotional environment.

Conclusion

As was stated earlier, techniques and methods discussed in this paper represent a collection of "experimental best bets" for increasing the likelihood of prosocial behaviors in young children. They are by no means exhaustive of all the methods that might be attempted (or that have been studied). On the other hand, if each of the approaches is incorporated into the overall early childhood setting, then the likelihood of subsequent prosocial behavior should be considerably increased.

Selected Bibliography

The following references are representative (though by no means exhaustive) of research concerning prosocial development in children. They are presented primarily for the individual who might like to further explore particular issues.

Altman, K. The effects of cooperative response acquisition on social behavior during free play. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1971, 12, 387-395.

Aronfreed, J. The socialization of altruism and sympathetic behavior: Some experimental and theoretical analyses. In J. Macaulay & L. Rerkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and Helping Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Azrin, N. H. & Lindsley, O. R. The reinforcement of cooperation between children. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 100-102.

Baldwin, C. P. & Baldwin, A. L. Children's judgements of kindness. Child Development, 1970, 41, 29-47.

Bandura, A. Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.

Bandura, A. & McDonald, F. J. Influence of social reinforcement and the behavior of models in shaping children's moral judgments. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 67, 274-281.

Barnett, M. A. Effects of competition and relative deservedness of the other's fate on children's generosity. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 655-666.

Barnett, M. A. & Andrews, J. A. Sex differences in children's reward allocation under competitive and cooperative instructional sets. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 85-86.

Barnett, M. A. & Bryan, J. H. Effects of competition with outcome feedback on children's helping behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 838-842.

Barnett, M. A., King, L. M. & Howard, J. A. Inducing affect about self or other: Effects on generosity in children. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 164-167.

Barnett, M. A., Matthews, K. A. & Howard, J. A. Relationship between competitiveness and empathy in 6- and 7-year-olds. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 221-222.

Barett D. E. & Yarrow M. R. Prosocial behavior, social inferential ability, and assertiveness in children. Child Development, 1977, 48, 475-481.

Bar Tal, D. Prosocial Behavior: Theory and Research. New York: Halstead, 1976.

Barton, E. J. & Ascione, F. R. Sharing in preschool children: Facilitation, stimulus generalization, response generalization, and maintenance. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1979, 12, 417-430.

Barton, E. J. & Osborne, J. G. The development of classroom sharing by a teacher using positive practice. Behavior Modification, 1978, 2, 231-250.

Bronfenbrenner, U. Two Worlds of Childhood: U.S. and U.S.S.R. New York: Touchstone, 1972.

Bryan, J. H. Children's cooperation and helping behaviors. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 5. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Bryan J. H. & London, P. Altruistic behaviors by children. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 200-211.

Bryan, J. H., Redfield, J. & Mader, S. Words and deeds about altruism and the subsequent reinforcement power of the model. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1501-1508.

Bryan, J. H. & Walbek, N. H. The impact of words and deeds concerning altruism upon children. Child Development, 1979, 41, 747-757.
Bryan, J. H. & Walbek, N. H. Preaching and practicing generosity: children's actions and reactions. Child Development, 1970, 41, 330-353.
Bryant, B. K. The effects of interpersonal context of evaluation on self- and other-enhancement behavior. Child Development, 1977, 48, 885-892.
Buckley, N., Siegel, L. S. & Ness, S. Egocentrism, empathy, and altruistic behavior in young children. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 329-330.
Burns, S. M. & Brainerd, C. J. Effects of constructive and dramatic play on perspective talking of very young children. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 512-521.
Charlesworth, R. & Hartup, W. W. Positive social reinforcement in the nursery school peer group. Child Development, 1967, 38, 993-1002.
Christy, P. R., Gelfand, D. M. & Hartmann, D. P. Effects of competition-induced frustration on two classes of modeled behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 104-111.
Coates, D. & Pusser, E. H. Positive reinforcement and punishment in "Sesame Street" and "Mister Rogers". Journal of Broadcasting, 1975, 19:2, 143-151.
Coates, D., Pusser, H. E. & Goodman, I. The influence of "Sesame Street" and "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" on children's social behavior in the preschool. Child Development, 1976, 47, 138-144.
Cohen, D. K. Justin and his peers: An experimental analysis of a child's social world. Child Development, 1962, 33, 697-717.
Collins, W. A. & Getz, S. K. Children's social responses following modeled reactions to provocation: Prosocial effects of a television drama. Journal of Personality, 1976, 44, 488-500.
Cook, C. & Stingle, S. Cooperative behavior in children. Psychological Bulletin, 1974, 81, 918-933.
Devin-Sheehan, L., Feldman, R. S. & Allen, V. L. Research on children tutoring children: A critical review. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 355-385.
DeVoe M. W. & Sherman T. M. A microtechnology for teaching prosocial behavior to children. Child Study Journal, 1978, 8, 83-91.
Dlugokinski, E. L. & Firestone, I. J. Other centeredness and susceptibility to charitable appeals: Effects of perceived discipline. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 21-28.
Doland, D. J. & Adelberg, K. The learning of sharing behavior. Child Development, 1967, 38, 695-700.
Dreman, S. B. & Greenbaum C. W. Altruism or reciprocity: Sharing behavior in Israeli kindergarten children. Child Development, 1973, 44, 61-68.
Eisenberg-Berg, N. Development of children's prosocial moral judgment. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 128-137.
Eisenberg-Berg, N. & Geisheker, E. Content of preachings and power of the model/preacher: The effect on children's generosity. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 168-175.
Eisenberg-Berg, N., Haake. R., Hand, M. & Sadalla, E. Effects of instructions concerning ownership of a toy on a preschool's sharing and defensive behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 460-461.
Eisenberg-Berg, N. & Hand, M. The relationship of preschoolers' reasoning about prosocial moral conflicts to prosocial behavior. Child Development, 1979, 50, 356-363.
Elliot, R. & Vasta, R. The modeling of sharing: Effects associated with vicarious reinforcement, symbolization, age and generalization. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1970, 10, 8-15.

Emler, J. P. & Rushton, J. P. Cognitive-developmental factors in children's generosity. British Journal of Clinical and Social Psychology, 1974, 13, 277-281.

Floody, D. R. Early intervention in prosocial development: A seminar for preschool teachers. ERIC Document # ED164 116.

Friedrich, L. K. & Stein, A. H. Aggressive and prosocial television programs and the natural behavior of preschool children. Monographs of SRCD, 1973, 38, No. 4.

Friedrich, L. K. & Stein, A. H. Prosocial television and young children: The effects of verbal labeling and role playing on learning and behavior. Child Development, 1975, 46, 27-38.

Friedrich-Cofer, L. K., Houston-Stein, A., McBride Kipmis, d., Susman, E. & Clewett, A. S. Environmental enhancement of prosocial television content: Effects on interpersonal behavior, imaginative play, and self-regulation in a natural setting. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 637-646.

Gaertner, A., Kohler, M. C., & Reisman, F. Children Teaching Children: Learning by Teaching. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Gagne, E. D. & Middlebrooks, M. R. Encouraging generosity: A perspective from social learning theory and research. Elementary School Journal, 1977, 77, 281-291.

Gelfand, D. M., Hartman, D. P., Cromer, C. C., Smith, C. L. & Page, P. C. The effects of instructional prompts and praise on children's donation rates. Child Development, 1975, 46, 980-983.

Grusec, J. E. Demand characteristics of the modeling experiment: Altruism as a function of age and aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 22, 139-149.

Grusec, J. E., Kuczynski, L., Rushton, J. P. & Simutis, Z. M. Modeling, direct instruction and attributions: Effects on altruism. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 51-57.

Grusec, J. E., Saas-Kortsaak, P. & Simutis, Z. M. The role of example and moral exhortation in the training of altruism. Child Development, 1978, 49, 920-923.

Grusec, J. E. & Skubiski, S. L. Model nurturance, demand characteristics of the modeling experiment, and altruism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 352-359.

Handlon, B. H. & Gross, P. The development of sharing behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 59, 425-428.

Harris, M. B. Reciprocity and generosity: Some determinants of sharing in children. Child Development, 1970, 41, 313-328.

Hart, B. M., Reynolds, N. J., Baer, D. M., Brawley, E. R. & Harris, F. R. Effect of contingent and noncontingent reinforcement on the cooperative play of a preschool child. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 73-76.

Hartup, W. W. & Coates, B. Imitation of a peer as a function of reinforcement from the peer group and rewardingness of the model. Child Development, 1967, 38, 1003-1016.

Hay, D. F. Cooperative interactions and sharing between very young children and their parents. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 647-653.

Hoffman, M. L. Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 937-943.

Hoffman, M. L. Childrearing practices and moral development: Generalizations from empirical research. Child Development, 1963, 34, 295-318.

Hoffman, M. L. Conscience, personality and socialization techniques. Human Development, 1970, 13, 90-120.

Hoffman, M. L. The development of altruistic motivation. In D. J. DePalma & L. M. Foley (Eds.), Moral Development: Current Research and Theory. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Hoffman, M. L. Development of moral thought, feeling and behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 34, 958-966.

Hoffman, M. L. & Saltzstein, H. D. Parent discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.

Iannotti, R. J. Effect of role-taking experiences on role taking, empathy, altruism, and aggression. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 119-124.

Isen, A. M., Horn, N. & Rosenhan, D. L. Effects of success and failure on children's generosity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 27, 239-247.

Israel, A. C. & Brown, M. S. Effects of directiveness of appeals and surveillance on the production and persistence of children's donations. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 1979, 29, 250-261.

Jensen, R. E. & Moore, S. G. The effect of attribute statements on cooperativeness and competitiveness in school-age boys. Child Development, 1977, 48, 305-307.

Johnson, D. W. Affective perspective-taking and cooperative predisposition. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 131-142.

Johnson, D. W. Cooperativeness and social perspective-taking. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 241-244.

Kagan, S. & Madsen, M. C. Cooperation and competition of Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American children of two ages under two instructional sets. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 32-39.

Kagan, S. & Madsen, M. C. Experimental analysis of cooperation and competition of Anglo-American and Mexican children. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 49-59.

Kaplan, R. M. & Singer, R. D. Television violence and viewer aggression: A review of the evidence. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 35-70.

Kaufman, H. Aggression and Altruism: A Psychological Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.

Kazdin, A. E. & Bryan, J. H. Competence and volunteering. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 87-97.

Keller, B. B. & Bell, R. Q. Child effects on adults method of eliciting altruistic behavior. Child Development, 1979, 50, 1004-1009.

Kenrick, D. T., Baumann, D. J. & Cialdini, R. B. A step in the socialization of negative mood on children's generosity under public and private conditions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 747-755.

Knight, G. P. & Kagan, S. Accultruation of prosocial and competitive behaviors among second- and third-generation Mexican-American children. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1977, 8, 273-283.

Kohlberg, L. Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Krebs, D. L. Altruism: An examination of the concept and review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 258-302.

Ladd, G. W. & Oden, S. The relationship between peer acceptance and children's ideas about helpfulness. Child Development, 1979, 50, 402-408.

Lane, I. M. & Coon, R. C. Reward allocation in preschool children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1382-1389.

Larsen, G. Y. & Kellogg, J. A developmental study of the relation between conservation and sharing behavior. Child Development, 1974, 45, 849-851.

Latane, B. & Darley, J. M. The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help? New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
Leahy, R. L. Development of conceptions of prosocial behavior: Information affecting rewards given for altruism and kindness. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 34-37.
Leeds, R. Altruism and the norm of giving. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 229-240.
Levine, L. E. & Hoffman, M. L. Empathy and cooperation in 4-year olds. Developmental Psychology, 1975, 11, 533-534.
London, P. The rescuers: Motivational hypotheses about Christians who saved Jews from the Nazis. In Macaulay & L. Berkowitz (Eds.), Altruism and Helping Behavior. New York: Academic Press, 1970.
Long, G. T. & Lerner, M. J. Deserving, the "personal contract," and altruistic behavior by children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 4, 551-556.
Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
Madsen, M. C. & Connor, C. Cooperative and competitive behavior of retarded and nonretarded children at two ages. Child Development, 1973, 44, 175-178.
Madsen, M. C. & Shapira, C. Cooperative and competitive behavior of Afro-American, Anglo-American, Mexican-American and Mexican village children. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 16-20.
Marcus, R. F. & Jenny, B. A naturalistic study of reciprocity in the helping behavior of young children. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 1977, 23, 195-206.
Marcus, R. F., Telleen, S. & Roke, E. J. Relation between cooperation and empathy in young children. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 346-347.
Masters, J. C. Effects of social comparison upon children's self-reinforcement and altruism toward competitors and friends. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 64-72.
Masters, J. C. Effects of social comparison on the imitation of altruistic and neutral behaviors by young children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 131-142.
Masters, J. C. & Pisarowicz, P. A. Self-reinforcement and generosity following two types of altruistic behavior. Child Development, 1975, 46, 313-318.
McClintock, C. G. & Nuttin, J. M. Development of competitive game behavior in children across two cultures. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1969, 5, 203-218.
McGuire, J. & Thomas, M. H. Effects of sex, competence, and competition on sharing behavior in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 490-494.
McKee, J. P. & Leader, F. B. The relationship of socio-economic status and aggression to the competitive behavior of preschool children. Child Development, 1955, 26, 135-142.
Midlarsky, E. & Bryan, J. H. Training charity in children. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 408-415.
Midlarsky, E., Bryan, J. H. & Brickman, P. Aversive approval: Interactive effects of modeling and reinforcement on altruistic behavior. Child Development, 1973, 44, 321-328.
Miller, A. G. & Thomas, R. Cooperation and competition among Blackfoot Indian and urban Canadian children. Child Development, 1972, 43, 1104-1110.
Moore, S. G. Considerateness and helpfulness in young children. Young Children, 1977, 32, 73-76.
Moore, B. S., Underwood, B. & Rosenhan, D. L. Affect and altruism. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 99-104.

Morris, W. N., Marshall, H. M. & Miller, R. S. The effects of vicarious punishment on prosocial behavior in children. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1973, 15, 222-236.

Murphy, L. B. Social Behavior and Child Personality: An Exploratory Study of Some Roots of Sympathy. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Mussen, P. & Eisenberg-Berg, N. The Roots of Caring, Sharing and Helping. San Francisco: Freeman, 1977.

Mussen, P., Harris, S., Rutherford, E. & Keasey, C. B. Honesty and altruism among preadolescents. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 3, 169-194.

Nelson, J. D., Gelfand, D. M. & Hartmann, D. D. Children's aggression following competition and exposure to an aggressive model. Child Development, 1969, 40, 1085-1097.

Nelson, L. & Madsen, M. C. Cooperation and competition among 4-year olders as a function of reward contingency and subculture. Developmental Psychology, 1969, 1, 340-344.

Olejnik, A. B. & McKinney, J. P. Parental value orientation and generosity in children. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 311.

Phillips, B. N. & D'Amico, L. A. Effects of cooperation and competition on the cohesiveness of small face-to-face groups. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 64, 329-334.

Piaget, J. The Moral Judgment of the Child. New York: Harcourt, 1932.

Presbie, R. J. & Coiteux, P. F. Learning to be generous or stingy: Imitation of sharing behavior as a function of model generosity and vicarious reinforcement. Child Development, 1971, 42, 1033-1038.

Reuter, J. & Unick, J. Social interaction in nursery schools. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 319-325.

Rheingold, H. L., Hay, D. F. & West, M. J. Sharing in the second year of life. Child Development, 1976, 47, 1148-1158.

Richmond, B. O. & Weiner, G. P. Cooperation and competition among young children as a function of ethnic grouping, grade, sex and reward condition. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1973, 64, 329-334.

Rocha, R. F. & Rogers, R. W. Ares and Babbitt in the classroom: Effects of competition and reward on children's aggression. Journal of Personality and Psychology, 1976, 33, 588-593.

Rosenhan, D. The kindness of children. In M. S. Smart & R. C. Smart (Eds.), Preschool Children: Development and Relationships. New York: MacMillan, 1972.

Rosenhan, D. Prosocial behavior of children. In W. W. Hartup (Ed.), The Young Child: Review of Research. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1972.

Rosenhan, D. & White, G. M. Observation and rehearsal as determinants of prosocial behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 424-431.

Rubin, K. H. Social interaction and communicative egocentrism in preschoolers. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1976, 129, 121-124.

Rubin, K. H. & Schneider, F. W. The relationship between moral judgment, egocentrism and altruistic behavior. Child Development, 1973, 44, 661-665.

Rushton, J. P. Generosity in children: Immediate and long-term effects of modeling, preaching and moral judgment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 459-466.

Rushton, J. P. Socialization and the altruistic behavior of children. Psychological Bulletin, 1976, 83, 898-913.

Rushton, J. P. & Wiener, J. Altruism and cognitive development in children. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 14, 341-349.

Rutherford, E. & Mussen, P. Generosity in nursery school boys. Child Development, 1968, 39, 755-765.
Scott, W. E. & Cherrington, D. J. Effects of competitive, cooperative, and individualistic reinforcement contingencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 748-758.
Shapira, A. & Madsen, M. C. Between- and within-group cooperation and competition among kibbutz and nonkibbutz children. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 140-145.
Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R. & Sherif, C. W. Intergroup Conflict and Cooperation: The Robbers Cave Experiment. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Institute of Group Relations, 1961.
Siegel, P. S., Butler, P. E. & Rickard, H. C. Concurrent socially undesirable behavior in cooperative and independent play. Psychological Record, 1971, 21, 207-211.
Skarin, K. & Moely, B. E. Altruistic behavior: An analysis of age and sex differences. Child Development, 1976, 47, 1159-1165.
Smith, C. L., Gelfand, D. M., Hartmann, D. P. & Partlow, M. Children's causal attributions regarding help giving. Child Development, 1979, 50, 203-210.
Staub, E. The Development of Prosocial Behavior in Children. New York: General Learning Press, 1975.
Staub, E. A child in distress: The effect of focusing responsibility on children in their attempts to help. Developmental Psychology, 1970, 2, 152-153.
Staub, E. A child in distress: The influence of age and number of witnesses on children's attempts to help. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 14, 130-140.
Staub, E. A child in distress: The influence of nurturance and modeling on children's attempts to help. Developmental Psychology, 1971, 5, 124-132.
Staub, E. Helping a person in distress: The influence of implicit and explicit "rules" of conduct on children and adults. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 137-144.
Staub, E. The learning and unlearning of aggression. In J. L. Singer (Ed.), The Control of Aggression and Violence: Cognitive and Physiological Factors. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
Staub, E. To rear a prosocial child: Reasoning, learning by doing, and learning by teaching others. In D. J. DePalma & J. M. Foley (Eds.), Moral Development: Current Theory and Research. New York: Wiley, 1975.
Staub, E. The use of role playing and induction in children's learning of helping and sharing behavior. Child Development, 1971, 42, 805-816.
Staub, E. & Sherk, L. Need for approval, children's sharing behavior, and reciprocity in sharing. Child Development, 1970, 41, 243-252.
Stein, A. H. & Friedrich, L. K. Impact of television on children and youth. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 5, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
Vogler, R. E., Masters, W. M. & Morrill, G. S. Shaping cooperative behavior in young children. Journal of Psychology, 1970, 74, 181-186.
Waxler-Zahn, C., Yarrow-Radke, M. & Smith-Brady, J. Perspective-taking and prosocial behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1977, 13, 87-88.
Waxler, C. Z., Yarrow, M. R. & King, R. A. Child rearing and children's prosocial initiations toward victims of distress. Child Development, 1979, 50, 319-330.
Weingold, H. P. & Webster, R. L. Effects of punishment on a cooperative behavior in children. Child Development, 1964, 35, 1211-1216.
Whiting, B. B. & Whiting, J. W. M. Children of Six Cultures: A Psycho-Cultural Analysis. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Wispe, L. G. Positive forms of social behavior: An overview. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 1-19.

Yarrow, M. R. & Scott, P. M. Imitation of nurturant and non-nurturant models. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 23, 259-270.

Yarrow, M. R., Scott, P. M. & Waxler, C. Z. Learning concern for others. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 8, 240-260.

Yarrow, M. R. & Waxler, C. Z. Dimensions and correlates of prosocial behavior in young children. Child Development, 1976, 46, 118-125.

Zinser, O., Perry, J. S. & Edgar, R. M. Affluence of the recipient, value of donations, and sharing behavior in preschool children. The Journal of Psychology, 1975, 89, 301-305.